



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/988,398	11/19/2001	Michel Marchisseau	01200.546	8244

7590

04/24/2003

LINIAK, BERENATO, LONGACRE & WHITE
Suite 240
6550 Rock Spring Drive
Bethesda, MD 20817

EXAMINER

KOCH, GEORGE R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1734

DATE MAILED: 04/24/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/988,398

Applicant(s)

MARCHISSEAU ET AL.

Examiner

George R. Koch III

Art Unit

1734

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 April 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 11-21 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 7-10 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 5, 6 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election without traverse of group I, claims 1-10 in Paper No. 8 is acknowledged.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the step of controlling and especially the optical system used in the step of controlling (as in claims 6-10 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

The brief description of the drawings does not include a description of the sheet labeled "*FIGURE POUR ABREGE*". It is noted that the figure on this sheet appears to be identical to Figure Four.

Page 13, line 10 of the specification makes reference to "centring holes 84" - this appears to be a misspelling.

Page 13, line 23 makes reference to "an inverted convex cone 86". However, page 13, line 12 had previously made reference to "guides 86". It appears that the inverted convex cone should have been references as number 88.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1-3, 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Honda (US Patent 6,500,294 B1).

Honda discloses a method of securing friction liners as claimed (see especially Figure 4).

Honda especially discloses that the friction liner has a support plate and adhesion zones (see, for example Figure 7). Honda further discloses an adhesive applying step consisting of depositing a predetermined amount of adhesive on the adhesive applying zone of an applying means, wherein the adhesion zone corresponds

Art Unit: 1734

to the adhesion zone (see especially Figures 19 through 27 which disclose various patterns and adhesion zones).

As to claim 2, Honda discloses a first, impregnation phase, and a second, adhesive applying phase (see also columns 21, lines 4 to 38, and for example, Figure

1).

As to claim 3, Honda discloses a backing head in the form of support 9 in Figure

1.

As to claim 5, Honda discloses rotating the support plate (also item 9, see Figure

1).

As to claim 6, Honda discloses controlling the application of adhesive via control of the thickness (see column 21, lines 4-38).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

Art Unit: 1734

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

8. Claim 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Honda as applied above, and further in view of Krenkel (US Patnet 6,042,935).

Honda does not discloses using opposed applicator heads.

Krenkel discloses that it is known to have friction liners on opposed sections of the support plate (see, for example, Figure 2 and 4). One in the art would appreciate that such an friction liner, when made by Honda's method, could require application of adhesive to both sides of the support plate. One would further realize that substantial time savings could be realized by applying the adhesive simultaneously to opposite faces of the support plate. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have utilized opposed applicators in order to achieve faster production times.

9. Claims 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Honda as applied above, and further in view of Krenkel Silverbrook (US Patent 6,530,339 B1)

Honda does not discloses using opposed applicator heads.

Krenkel discloses that it is known to have friction liners on opposed sections of the support plate (see, for example, Figure 2 and 4). One in the art would appreciate that such an friction liner, when made by Honda's method, could require application of adhesive to both sides of the support plate. One would further realize that substantial time savings could be realized by applying the adhesive simultaneously to opposite faces of the support plate, as suggested by Silverbrook, which uses opposed

Art Unit: 1734

applicators (Figure 1, item 16). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have utilized opposed applicators in order to achieve faster production times.

10. Claims 1 and 2 are further rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bacher (US Patent 6,102,184) in view of Sakano (JP 3-88347, published April 12, 1991).

Bacher discloses method of securing friction liner on an annular support plate, the plate having an outer periphery defining a radial blade having opposed lateral faces including at least one lateral fastening face which defines an adhesion zone of predetermined form positioned on the fastening face, the method being a method of adhesively bonding the friction lines on at least one said lateral fastening face and comprising

an adhesive applying step which consists in depositing a predetermined quantity of adhesive on said adhesion zone (see column 1, line 63 to column 2, line 4).

Bacher does not disclose that the deposition of adhesive is carried out by means of an adhesive applicator defining an adhesive applying zone, the form of which corresponds to that of the adhesion zone.

Sakano discloses means for performing the deposition of adhesive, wherein the means of an adhesive application define an adhesive applying zone, the form of which corresponds to that of the adhesion zone (See Figure 1, items 1a). Sakano discloses that the adhesive is first impregnated onto the applicator head, and second, the

Art Unit: 1734

applicator head contacts the adhesion zone and transfers the adhesive. Sakano discloses that such an adhesive applicator ensures that there is no irregularity in the thickness of the resin or adhesive, and thus ensures proper bonding positions and quantities. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have utilized a deposition means as in Sakano in order to ensure proper bonding and bonding positioning.

As to claim 2, Sakano as applied in claim 1 discloses the impregnation and transfer steps as claimed.

Allowable Subject Matter

11. Claims 7-10 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

12. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The prior art of record, while disclosing the adhesive applying steps and the use of applicator heads and control of the adhesive quantity (see, for example, Bacher and Sakano, as applied above, or Honda as applied above), makes no disclosure of using an optical system to detect either the presence of adhesive on the support plate but outside the adhesion zone (as recited in claim 6) or absence of adhesive on at least a part of the adhesion zone (as recited in claim 7).

Art Unit: 1734


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to George R. Koch III whose telephone number is (703) 305-3435 (TDD only). If the applicant cannot make a direct TDD-to-TDD call, the applicant can communicate by calling the Federal Relay Service at 1-800-877-8339 and giving the operator the above TDD number. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 10-7.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Crispino can be reached on (703) 308-3853. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-7718 for regular communications and (703) 305-3599 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.



George R. Koch III
April 21, 2003



RICHARD CRISPINO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700